

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-3 are pending. By this Amendment, the title and claims 1 is amended, and claims 5-9 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to the title, as allegedly not descriptive. The title has been amended substantially as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Claim 7 has been canceled, and thus, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Hosoda et al. (hereinafter "Hosoda"), U.S. Patent No. 3,805,542, and claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hosoda, and further in view of Scott, U.S. Patent No. 3,872,684. The features of claim 9 have been added to independent claim 1, and claims 5-9 have been canceled. These rejections are respectfully traversed in so far as they apply to claims 1-3.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an outdoor centrifugal fan positioned opposite to the outdoor heat exchanger that generates a centrifugal force to blow the outdoor air, wherein the outdoor centrifugal fan comprises a hub positioned so as to face the outdoor heat exchanger, wherein the hub is formed in a disc shape, and is connected to a driving motor by a rotational

Amendment dated February 17, 2010

Reply to Office Action of October 26, 2009

shaft; a plurality of blades each having one end protruding from a surface of the hub, and disposed at an outer side of the hub in a circumferential direction with the same interval therebetween; and a supporting ring coupled to another end of each of the plurality of blades to support the plurality of blades; and a dispersion ring connected to the hub of the outdoor centrifugal fan by a plurality of supporting ribs. None of the applied references, taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests such features, or the claimed combination of independent claim 1.

That is, the Examiner acknowledged at page 7 of that Office Action that Hosoda “fail[s] to explicitly teach, wherein the dispersion ring is connected to a hub of the outdoor centrifugal fan by a supporting ring, and wherein the dispersing ring is respectively connected to the blades of the outdoor centrifugal fan by the supporting ring thus to form a ring shape, and wherein the dispersion ring is connected to the hub of the centrifugal fan by a plurality of support ribs.” The Examiner then asserted that “Scott teaches a condensate dispersion unit assembly (referring to figures 1-5) comprising a dispersion ring (24) connected to the fan via a plurality of support ribs (lugs 22), wherein both the dispersion ring and support ribs are connected to a fan (18).” The Examiner then concluded that “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the air conditioner of Hosoda [ ] to include the condensation dispersion unit assembly to a fan as taught by Scott in order to prevent insects and bacteria from building up inside of the air conditioner, thus preventing a user [from] being contaminated.”

However, the dispersion ring 24 in Scott is coupled to blades of the blower fan 18 by lugs 22, while the claimed dispersion ring is connected to the hub of the outdoor centrifugal fan by a plurality of supporting ribs. Therefore, a diameter of the dispersion ring 24 in Scott must be larger than a diameter of the fan 18, and it is difficult to couple the dispersion ring 24 to the blades of the fan 18 because of the twisting angles of the blades. Further, the dispersion ring 24 coupled to the blades of the fan 18 would be easily separated considering the thickness of the blades.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines over the applied prior art. Dependent claims 2-3 are allowable over the applied prior art at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **10/576,880**


Docket No. **P-0773**

Amendment dated February 17, 2010

Reply to Office Action of October 26, 2009

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck  
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 CLD:pb:tlg

**Date: February 17, 2010**

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-942\222759.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**